

Sir:

In response to the Office action mailed Oct.17 2005.

Amendments to the Claims will be mailed separately after my request for an interview is granted. My request for such an interview is based on the following reasons.

- A. Subject matter of the present invention, application number 10/775,697 and the references of the prior art that are used by the examiner for the rejection of the claims of the present invention are different (35 U.S.C. 102, 103.)
- B. As it can be found in the specification of the application refers to “Interior Blind Spot Mirror,” (the title of the invention) of which the object is to “provide an interior blind spot mirror capable of covering the dead angle and completely eliminating the blind spot.” (See the opening sentence of SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION)
- C. I will provide further evidence whenever requested to support my argument if the above description in the specification of the application doesn’t clarify the difference in Subject matter between a rearview mirror which the examiner uses as prior art for the rejection of the present invention and an interior blind spot mirror of the present invention.
- D. I find the examiner’s rejection to the claims of the present invention, even if the prior art he used for the purpose of rejection was pertinent and reasonable, is groundless and does not comply with the Nature of the Examination (37 U.S.C. 1.104) at all.



I respectfully look forward to your response and instruction for the continuity of the prosecution of the application.

Xiaoda (Richard) Xiao